

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-23 are pending, while claims 19-23 are under consideration. Claims 19 and 23 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments to claims 19 and 23 may be found in the claims as filed originally. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested. In particular, the Office Action asserts in section 2 at page 2 that "it is unclear whether the applicant is claiming an internal device, an external device, or both," due to the presence of an "or" clause in claim 23.

As provided for at M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(h)(II), however, "or" terminology does not render a claim indefinite. In particular:

Alternative expressions using "or" are acceptable, such as "wherein R is A, B, C, or D." The following phrases were each held to be acceptable and not in violation of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph in *In re Gaubert*, 524 F.2d 1222, 187 USPQ 664 (CCPA 1975): "made entirely or in part of"; "at least one piece"; and "iron, steel or any other magnetic material."

Still, in the interests of compact prosecution only, and not for any reason of patentability, claim 23 has been amended to define it more clearly. It is submitted that claims 23, as amended, meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tung, US Patent Publication Number 2002/0116497 (hereinafter referred to as "Tung"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In several embodiments, the claimed invention provides communications control technology for achieving sufficient data quality in telephonic communications and sufficient security. In the communication control method claimed in claims 19-23, although terminals connected through a network are multi-stage connected, neighboring terminals report mutual communications sessions to each other prior to the start of communication, and identify communications by combining the mutual communications sessions. Thus, a plurality of

communications may be established with one port number.

Claim 19, in particular, recites:

A reporting step of reporting to the second communications terminal T2 first communications identification information S1 identifying communications between the second communications terminal T2 and the first communications terminal T1.

Tung neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “a reporting step of reporting to the second communications terminal T2 first communications identification information S1 identifying communications between the second communications terminal T2 and the first communications terminal T1,” as recited in claim 19. User A logging into a server is not equivalent to “a reporting step of reporting to the second communications terminal T2 first communications identification information S1 identifying communications between the second communications terminal T2 and the first communications terminal T1,” contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. In Tung, rather, Client A acquires connection information for client B from a SIM server (S108, Figure 1).

Claim 19 recites further:

A communications step of communication with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmissions and reception of data containing the first communications identification information S1 and second communications identification information S2.

Tung neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “a communications step of communication with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmissions and reception of data containing the first communications identification information S1 and second communications identification information S2,” as recited in claim 19, either. Simply connecting a call is not equivalent to “a communications step of communication with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmissions and reception of data containing the first communications identification information S1 and second communications identification information S2,” contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. In Tung, rather, Client A connects with Client B before commencing a PC-to-PC call (S110, Figure 1). Therefore, Client A only notifies the SIM server its login information, and connection information is merely acquired from the SIM server in order to connect to Client B. Furthermore, Client A immediately proceeds to transmitting only voice communication data after connecting to Client B (S112, Figure 1). Claim 19 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is earnestly solicited.

Independent claims 20-22 contain similar features to those disclosed in claim 19.

Therefore, it is submitted that claims 20-22 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Claim 23:

Claim 23 recites:

A communications method performed by a secure host for when, via a secure host defending against wrongful access from without, an internal terminal device connected to a network on the inside of the secure host and an external terminal device connected to a network on the outside carry out voice communications.

Tung neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “a communications method performed by a secure host for when, via a secure host defending against wrongful access from without, an internal terminal device connected to a network on the inside of the secure host and an external terminal device connected to a network on the outside carry out voice communications,” as recited in claim 23. In Tung, rather, client A communicates directly with client B (S110 and S112, Figure 1).

Claim 23 recites further:

When a call between the external terminal device and the internal terminal device is established, reporting to the two terminal devices a path readied in advance for transmitting and receiving voice data, and communications identification information for distinguishing what is voice data between the terminal devices, and meanwhile storing terminal-device information identifying the two terminal devices, correlative with the communications identification information reported to the two terminal devices.

Tung neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “when a call between the external terminal device and the internal terminal device is established, reporting to the two terminal devices a path readied in advance for transmitting and receiving voice data, and communications identification information for distinguishing what is voice data between the terminal devices, and meanwhile storing terminal-device information identifying the two terminal devices, correlative with the communications identification information reported to the two terminal devices,” as recited in claim 23, either. In Tung, rather, a web server only notifies client A of connection information of client B (step 108 in Fig. 1)

Finally, claim 23 recites:

When the secure host has received from the external terminal device or the internal terminal device voice data containing the communications identification information, specifying, from the terminal-device information stored correlative with the communications identification information, a communications-destination terminal device for the voice data, and sending out received voice data to the specified terminal device.

Tung neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "when the secure host has received form the external terminal device or the internal terminal device voice data containing the communications identification information, specifying, from the terminal-device information stored correlative with the communications identification information, a communications-destination terminal device for the voice data, and sending out received voice data to the specified terminal device," as recited in claim 23, either. Simply connecting a call is not equivalent to "when the secure host has received form the external terminal device or the internal terminal device voice data containing the communications identification information, specifying, from the terminal-device information stored correlative with the communications identification information, a communications-destination terminal device for the voice data, and sending out received voice data to the specified terminal device," contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. Claim 23 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 19-23 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 19-23 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:


Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

Date: 23 FEB 06

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501